

**REMARKS:**

Reconsideration of the above-identified application is respectfully requested.

Initially it is acknowledged with appreciation that system claims 1-12 have been deemed allowable by the USPTO and Applicants IDS and cited references have been accepted and considered.

Device claim 13 has been amended to clarify the recitation of the antenna device of the invention. Such amendment finds basis throughout the specification and claims as originally filed particularly at pages 11, 13, 18 and 19 thereof. A clean copy of claim 13 is attached as **APPENDIX I.**

**THE REJECTION OF DEVICE CLAIMS 13-19 and 21-26 UNDER 35 USC 103:**

Numbered paragraphs 1-2 of the Official Action, rejects device claims 13-19 and 21-26 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art teaching a stacked plate (herein referred to a "patch") GPS antenna, in view of US Patent 6,248,393 to Bunyan et al.

Bunyan et al discloses shielding, ..."to confine the EMI energy within a source device, and to insulate that device from ... from other source devices" ... (column 1, lines 32-38), by means of a multi-layer gasket having a porous fabric member with ..."an electrically conductive first side....being constructed of electrically-conductive wire, monofilament, yams or other fibers or, alternatively, by reason of a treatment such as by plating or sputtering being applied to non-conductive fibers to provide a

conductive layer thereon" (column 5, lines 36-48).

The present application discloses means for enhancing the reception of EMI energy by a patch antenna, with amended claim 13 claiming an improved electromagnetic signal receiving antenna having a polymeric composition containing a random suspension of metal particles engaging the EMI energy receiving surface of a positive plate of the antenna. Claim 14 recites encasing a patch antenna assembly with said composition.

Bunyan et al teaches using a continuous layer of electrically conductive fabric to isolate and shield a device from EMI energy passing to or from it, while the present application teaches engaging an electromagnetic signal receiving surface of an antenna device with a polymer composition containing metal particles to enhance the collection of EMI energy at the receiving surface. In short, the functional utility of the Bunyan et al disclosure appears to be in direct conflict with the functional utility of the present claimed invention.

At page 3, of the Official Action, the USPTO appears to assert that Bunyan et al provides motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to encase an EMI energy receiving antenna so as to insulate (e.g. shield) an EMI energy receiving antenna from interfering EMI signals from other electromagnetic sources. Such reasoning appears at least strained, and frankly counter functional logic.

Bunyan et al teaches gross shielding from the passage of electromagnetic signals, with no apparent disclosure of selective shielding. If anything, one of ordinary skill in the art is

clearly taught by Bunyan et al that its gasket is a functional barrier, preventing passage of gross electromagnetic signals both to and from a gasketed device. Is the USPTO actually asserting that it would be obvious to encase an antenna, whose functional purpose is to receive and/or transmit electromagnetic signals, with a shield described by Bunyan et al as a functional barrier to the passage of electromagnetic signals?

If the USPTO is going to attribute any motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art from the disclosure of Bunyan et al, then the USPTO must also attribute the effect the functional premise Bunyan et al has on such motivation. The overwhelming import of the disclosure of Bunyan is that a conductive metal shields the passage of electromagnetic signals. It takes a leap in logic for one of ordinary skill in the art to even contemplate any use for Bunyan's conductive shielding in association with an antenna whose functional purpose is to transmit and/or receive electromagnetic signals, much more to contemplate a motivation which suggests its use can enhance the receipt and/or transmittal of electromagnetic signals. The obvious conclusion imparted to one of ordinary skill in the art is that Bunyan et al has no functional utility in regard to an antenna. It would appear to this Applicant, that any connection that is being made by the USPTO to enhancing receipt of signals, appears in functional conflict with Bunyan and thus as emanating from the disclosure of the present application rather than the disclosure of Bunyan et al.

Claim 13 has been amended to adopt details presented at page 4, numbered paragraph 3 of the Official Action and to clarify the recitation noted by the USPTO at page 5, numbered paragraph 5 of the Official Action. It is believed the adoption of these details and clarification resolve the relevancy of the arguments presented in Applicant's first response and distinguish the claimed device, from any logical application of the teaching of Bunyan et al.

As to the claims 14-26, each of these claims are directly or indirectly dependent upon claim 13, and appear allowable in view of the amendments to claim 13.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted the cited Bunyan et al reference does not obviate the invention of claims 13-26, but to the contrary, that the sum of its disclosure actually teaches away from any functional application to the claimed antenna device of the present claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 1-26 appear patentable under any combination of the cited references and it is requested that action toward allowance thereof be instituted.

Respectfully submitted,

CROSSETTA & ASSOCIATES



William J. Crossetta, Jr.  
Reg. No. 25790  
905 Convention Towers  
43 Court Street  
Buffalo, New York 14202

Tel: (716) 852-3935  
Fax: (716) 856-3091

Dated: May 23, 2003